

*Claim 5  
Cancelled*

42. (New) A method according to claim 41 wherein said filter has a plurality of segments and wherein said filtering comprises filtering a different color component via each of said segments.

#### REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action of December 12, 2002. Reexamination, reconsideration, and allowance of the application and all presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this First Response, claims 1-42 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 11, and 20 are directly amended herein, and claims 29-42 are newly added. Furthermore, amendments to Figures 1-4 have been submitted herewith. It is believed that the foregoing amendments add no new matter to the present application.

#### Drawing Objections

Figures 1-4 are objected to in the Office Action. In this regard, it is asserted in the Office Action that these figures should be designated as "Prior Art." To comply with requirements in the Office Actions, Applicants submit herewith amendments to Figures 1-4 and request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

### Response to §102 Rejections

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See, e.g., *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

#### Claim 1

Claim 1 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Owen* (U.S. Patent No. 6,464,359). Claim 1, as amended, reads as follows:

1. A system for optical projection of a complete image, using a lightvalve, said system comprising:  
a lenticular array composed of lenticules positioned onto said lightvalve; and  
a filter placed about a projection lens, said filter aligned with the pixels of  
said lenticular array, said filter depending upon the shape of said lenticules in said  
lenticular array, ***wherein said filter and projection lens are arranged such that  
color components separately output by said filter for one of said pixels are  
combined and focused onto a location.*** (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Owen* does not disclose each element of pending claim 5. In particular, *Owen* fails to disclose at least the features of claim 1 highlighted hereinabove.

In this regard, it is asserted in the Office Action that “*Owen et al. teaches in figure 1 a system for optical projection of a complete image, using a light valve (110), a lenticular array (120) composed of lenticules positioned onto the light valve (110), and a filter (170) placed about a projection lens.*” However, Applicants assert that *Owen* specifically discloses that the filter 170 is ““active’ (in the sense that the colors of the filter segments are sequenced).” Col. 2, lines 53-55. Thus, it appears that *Owen* describes a projection system that “can sequence colors.” See col. 2, lines 62-64. As an example, it appears that the projection system of *Owen* may sequence the colors of red, green, and blue for a particular pixel onto a destination screen.

However, the “filter” described by pending claim 1 is not “active” within the meaning of the term defined by *Owen*. In this regard, rather than sequencing different color components of a pixel, as described by *Owen*, the color components of one pixel separately output by the filter of claim 1 are “**combined** and focused onto a location.” (Emphasis added). Such a feature does not appear to be described by *Owen* and does not appear to be inherent within the system disclosed by *Owen*. For at least this reason, Applicants assert that *Owen* fails to disclose each feature of claim 1, as amended, and Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 2-4 and 6-9**

Claims 2-4 and 6-9 presently stand rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Owen*. Applicants submit that the pending dependent claims 2-4 and 6-9 contain all features of their respective independent claim 1. Since claim 1 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 2-4 and 6-9 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

#### **Response to §103 Rejections**

Claim 5 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over *Owen* in view of *Kingslake*, and claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over *Owen* in view of *Kingslake* and *Takahashi* (U.S. Patent No. 6,398,365). Further, claims 11-14, 16-23, and 25-28 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly

unpatentable over *Owen* in view of *Lee* (U.S. Patent No. 5,629,743), and claims 15 and 24 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over *Owen* in view of *Lee* and *Kingslake*. Applicants respectfully assert that *Owen* is not a proper prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. §103. Therefore, the aforementioned rejections of claims 5 and 10-28 are improper and should be withdrawn.

In this regard, according to 35 U.S.C. §103(c):

“Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.”

Submitted herewith is a Statement under 35 U.S.C. §103 establishing that the claimed inventions of the instant application and the subject matter of *Owen* were, at the time the claimed inventions were made, owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P. Thus, *Owen* may not be used as a prior art reference to reject the claimed inventions of the instant application under 35 U.S.C. §103. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections of claims 5 and 10-28 be withdrawn.

### **Claim 29**

Claim 29 has been newly added via the amendments set forth herein. Claim 29 presently reads as follows:

29. An optical projection system, said system comprising:  
a lenticular array having lenticules positioned to receive light from  
lightvalves; and  
a filter placed about a projection lens, said filter aligned with the pixels of  
said lenticular array, said filter having a first, second and third segments, the first  
segment carrying a first color component, said second segment carrying a second  
color component, and said third segment carrying a third color component, wherein  
said filter and projection lens are arranged such that each of said color components  
are combined and focused onto a location.

Applicants submit that each of the features of claim 29 set forth above are not disclosed or suggested by the references properly cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 29 is allowable.

### **Claims 30-33**

Claims 30-33 have been newly added via the amendments set forth herein. Applicants submit that the pending dependent claims 30-33 contain all features of their respective independent claim

29. Since claim 29 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 30-33 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

### **Claims 34-37**

Claims 34-37 have been newly added via the amendments set forth herein. Applicants submit that the pending dependent claims 34-37 contain all features of their respective independent claim

11. Since claim 11 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 34-37 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

### **Claim 38**

Claim 38 has been newly added via the amendments set forth herein. Claim 38 presently reads as follows:

38. An optical projection method, comprising:  
transmitting light from lightvalves through a lenticular array;  
transmitting said light from said lenticular array through a filter, said filter aligned with the pixels of said lenticular array;  
separately outputting, from said filter, different color components of one of said pixels; and  
combining and focusing each of said color components for said one pixel onto a location.

Applicants submit that each of the features of claim 38 set forth above are not disclosed or suggested by the references properly cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 38 is allowable.

### **Claim 39**

Claim 39 has been newly added via the amendments set forth herein. Applicants submit that the pending dependent claim 39 contains all features of its respective independent claim 38. Since claim 38 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claim 39 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**Claim 40**

Claim 40 has been newly added via the amendments set forth herein. Claim 40 presently reads as follows:

40. An optical projection method, comprising:  
transmitting light from lightvalves through a lenticular array;  
filtering said light transmitted from said lightvalves; and  
separately modulating chrominance and luminance components of said light.

Applicants submit that each of the features of claim 40 set forth above are not disclosed or suggested by the references properly cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 40 is allowable.

**Claims 41 and 42**

Claims 41 and 42 have been newly added via the amendments set forth herein. Applicants submit that the pending dependent claims 41 and 42 contain all features of their respective independent claim 40. Since claim 40 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 41 and 42 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted ,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER  
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jon E. Holland  
Reg. No. 41,077  
(256) 704-3900 Ext. 103

Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

**ANNOTATED VERSION OF MODIFIED CLAIMS**

**TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

The following is a marked up version of the amended claims, wherein brackets denote deletions and underlining denotes additions.

1. (Once Amended) A system for optical projection of a complete image, using a lightvalve, said system comprising:  
a lenticular array composed of lenses positioned onto said lightvalve; and  
a filter placed about a projection lens, said filter aligned with the pixels of said lenticular array, said filter depending upon the shape of said lenses in said lenticular array, wherein said filter and projection lens are arranged such that color components separately output by said filter for one of said pixels are combined and focused onto a location.
  
5. (Once Amended) [A system according to claim 4] A system for optical projection of a complete image, using a lightvalve, said system comprising:  
a lenticular array composed of lenses positioned onto said lightvalve; and  
a filter placed about a projection lens, said filter aligned with the pixels of said lenticular array, said filter depending upon the shape of said lenses in said lenticular array, wherein said filter is composed of a first, second and third segments, said first segment carrying signals of a first color component, said second segment carrying signals of a second color component, and said third segment carrying signals of a third color component, wherein said first and third segments are equal in area and where said second segment is larger in area than said first or third segments.

11. (Once Amended) A system for optical projection of a complete image, using a first and second lightvalves, said system comprising:

a lenticular array composed of lenticules positioned to receive light from said first and second lightvalves [built onto said first lightvalve]; and

a filter placed about a projection lens, said filter aligned with the pixels of said lenticular array, [said filter depending upon the shape of said lenticules in said lenticular array,] further wherein said system functions to separate chrominance and luminance components of said complete image into separate images.

20. (Once Amended) A system for optical projection of a complete image, using a first and second lightvalves, said system comprising:

a lenticular array composed of lenticules positioned to receive light from said first and second lightvalves [built onto said first lightvalve]; and

a filter placed about a relay lens, said filter aligned with the pixels of said lenticular array, [said filter depending upon the shape of said lenticules in said lenticular array,] further wherein said system functions to process chrominance and luminance components of said complete image into separate images.